

1
2
3
4
5 UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT
6 WESTERN DISTRICT OF WASHINGTON
AT SEATTLE

7 HELIO J. LEAL DE LA HOZ,)
8) CASE NO. C18-0260RSM
Plaintiff,)
9) ORDER DIRECTING PLAINTIFF TO
v.) AMEND COMPLAINT
10)
11 AMAZON.COM, INC., and the)
GOVERNMENT OF THE UNITED)
12 STATES,)
13)
Defendants.)
14)

15 *Pro Se* Plaintiff Helio J. Leal de La Hoz, a Seattle resident, filed his Complaint on
16 February 22, 2018. Dkt. #5. Summonses have not yet been issued.

17
18 Plaintiff alleges that he has been a victim of “sabotage,” that he has lost under “strange
19 circumstances” three laptops he purchased from Amazon.com, and ultimately “the evidence he
20 has against Amazon is evidence against the government.” Dkt. #5-3. He alleges violations of
21 “18 U.S.C. § 2340A – Torture,” “18 U.S.C. § 1117 – Conspiracy to Commit Murder,” 18 U.S.C.
22 § 1111 – Murder,” and “adrenaline poisoning.” *Id.*

23
24 As federal courts are courts of limited jurisdiction, a plaintiff bears the burden of
25 establishing that his case is properly filed in federal court. *Kokkonen v. Guardian Life Ins. Co.*,
26 511 U.S. 375, 377, 114 S. Ct. 1673, 1675, 128 L. Ed. 2d 391 (1994); *In re Ford Motor*
27 *Co./Citibank (South Dakota), N.A.*, 264 F.3d 952, 957 (9th Cir. 2001). This burden, at the
28

1 pleading stage, must be met by pleading sufficient allegations to show a proper basis for the
2 federal court to assert subject matter jurisdiction over the action. *McNutt v. General Motors*
3 *Acceptance Corp.*, 298 U.S. 178, 189, 56 S. Ct. 780, 785, 80 L. Ed. 1135 (1936). Further, the
4 Court will dismiss a Complaint at any time if the action fails to state a claim, raises frivolous or
5 malicious claims, or seeks monetary relief from a defendant who is immune from such relief.
6
7 *See* 28 U.S.C. § 1915(e)(2)(B).

8 In this case, Mr. Leal de La Hoz fails to identify any basis for federal jurisdiction in his
9 Complaint. He fails to adequately explain how each of the Defendants have violated the federal
10 statutes that he asserts as the bases of this claims. This is particularly problematic given the
11 exhibits attached by Plaintiff, wherein Plaintiff discusses numerous alleged actions taken by
12 others who are not the named Defendants, nor appear to be related in any way to the named
13 Defendants. *See* Dkt. #5, Exs. 1-34. As a result, Plaintiff's Complaint suffers from deficiencies
14 that, if not corrected in an Amended Complaint, require dismissal.
15

16 Accordingly, the Court hereby ORDERS that Plaintiff shall file an Amended Complaint
17 **no later than twenty-one (21) days from the date of this Order.** In the Amended Complaint,
18 Plaintiff must include a short and plain statement demonstrating to the Court that there is a legal
19 basis for his claims. Plaintiff shall identify conduct the named Defendant **only** has committed
20 that allegedly violated his rights.
21

22 In addition, **Plaintiff is reminded that he is not to include personal identifiers in his**
23 **Amended Complaint, such as complete bank or credit card account numbers, social**
24 **security numbers, and the like, and that such information should be redacted or removed**
25 **from his documents before filing.**
26
27
28

1 The Clerk shall send a copy of this Order to Mr. Leal de La Hoz at 77 S. Washington St.,
2 Seattle, WA 98104.

3 DATED this 26 day of February, 2018.

4
5
6 

7 RICARDO S. MARTINEZ
8 CHIEF UNITED STATES DISTRICT JUDGE
9
10
11
12
13
14
15
16
17
18
19
20
21
22
23
24
25
26
27
28